

ЧВЕРТЬ СТОЛІТТЯ УКРАЇНСЬКО-АМЕРИКАНСЬКОЇ ДРУЖБИ: **ДОСВІД ГІДНИЙ МАЙБУТНЬОГО**



ЗБІРНИК МАТЕРІАЛІВ
III АМЕРИКАНОЗНАВЧОЇ МУЛЬТИДИСЦИПЛІНАРНОЇ КОНФЕРЕНЦІЇ
ЛЬВІВ, 12 - 13 КВІТНЯ 2016 РОКУ

ЛЬВІВСЬКИЙ НАЦІОНАЛЬНИЙ УНІВЕРСИТЕТ
ІМЕНІ ІВАНА ФРАНКА
ФАКУЛЬТЕТ МІЖНАРОДНИХ ВІДНОСИН
ЦЕНТР АМЕРИКАНСЬКИХ СТУДІЙ

**Чверть століття
українсько-американської дружби:
досвід гідний майбутнього**

Збірник матеріалів
III американознавчої мультидисциплінарної
конференції

(видано за підтримки Інституту Кеннана)

Львівський національний університет
імені Івана Франка,
12-13 квітня 2016 р.

УДК 327 (73+477)

ББК Тз(4Укр)6-64я431+Тз(7США)6-64я431

Ч-334

За повного або часткового використання матеріалів збірника посилання на видання обов'язкове.

Матеріали надруковані методом прямого відтворення тексту, наданого авторами, які несуть відповідальність за його достовірність, зміст і стилістику, за правильне цитування джерел та посилання на них.

Організаційний комітет не несе відповідальності за погляди, висловлені авторами матеріалів.

Друкується за рішенням Організаційного комітету відповідно до протоколу № 8 Вченої Ради факультету міжнародних відносин Львівського національного університету імені Івана Франка від 22.02.2016.

Упорядники: Калитчак Р. Г., Зазуляк З. М.

Автор обкладинки: Романюк Р. Й.

Ч-334 Чверть століття українсько-американської дружби: досвід гідний майбутнього: зб. матеріалів III американознавчої мультидисциплінарної конференції (м. Львів, 12-13.04.2016) / упоряд. Калитчак Р. Г., Зазуляк З. М. – Львів : 2016. – 432 с.

ISBN 978-617-7065-51-6

У збірнику вміщені матеріали Третьої американознавчої мультидисциплінарної конференції «Чверть століття українсько-американської дружби: досвід гідний майбутнього», у яких з мультидисциплінарної перспективи комплексно та всебічно розглянуто різні аспекти взаємовідносин між Україною і Сполученими Штатами Америки у політичній, економічній, правовій, безпековій, науково-освітній, медійній і культурній сферах упродовж останніх двадцяти п'яти років.

УДК 327 (73+477)

ББК Тз(4Укр)6-64я431+Тз(7США)6-64я431

Електронна версія:

<http://international.lnu.edu.ua/us-conference-2016/>

ISBN 978-617-7065-51-6

- © Центр американських студій факультету міжнародних відносин ЛНУ ім. І. Франка, 2016
- © Автори статей, 2016

Гулай Василь (Національний університет «Львівська політехніка»). <i>Візит віце-президента США Джо Байдена 7-8 грудня 2015 р. та перспективи боротьби з корупцією й модернізації України: реалії та імітації наступних 100 днів</i>	224
Камінський Ігор (Національний університет «Одеська юридична академія»). <i>«М'яка сила» у політиці США та України: порівняльний аспект</i>	230
Мацієвський Юрій (Національний університет «Острозька академія»). <i>Як Україні вислизнути з пастки гібридності і почати рух уперед</i>	235
Михальчук Світлана (Східноєвропейський національний університет імені Лесі Українки). <i>Електронний менеджмент виборчого процесу в США: висновки для України</i>	245
Орлова Тетяна (Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка). <i>Історичні уроки Сполучених Штатів Америки для України</i>	256
Півнева Любов (Харківський національний педагогічний університет імені Г. С. Сковороди). <i>Демократичні цінності в контексті демократичного ідеалу (Україна – США)</i>	265
Степаненко Віктор (Інститут соціології НАН України, м. Київ) <i>Громадянське суспільство в Україні: інституціональні особливості розвитку і американські впливи</i>	272
Чебатарьов Єгор (ДЗ «Луганський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка», м. Старобільськ). <i>Українсько-американські витоки та майбутнє волонтерського руху на Донбасі</i>	278
Шеренговський Дмитро (Український католицький університет, м. Львів). <i>Виклики пост-конфліктного відновлення: Реконструкція 1865-1877 рр. в США та її досвід для України</i>	283

HOW CAN UKRAINE BREAK OUT OF HYBRIDITY AND START MOVING FORWARD?¹

YURIY MATSIYEVSKY

PhD in Political Science,

*Assoc. Professor of the Department of Political Science
Ostroh Academy National University*

Summary. *Ineffective institutional equilibrium, exacerbated by the February 2014 revolution and the Russian counter revolution, brought Ukraine to the state of near systemic collapse. With the existing set of leaders and institutions Ukraine could hardly reform itself. In order to survive, Ukraine needs stronger ties to the Western institution than current EU-Ukraine's Association Agreement could provide.*

Keywords: *institutional trap, systemic vulnerability, hybrid regime, Ukraine.*

Trapped in hybridity

One way to explain the Ukraine's impasse with reforms is to apply the concept of institutional trap [9]. Institutional trap is a set of inefficient yet stable institutions that none of the major players is interested to change. In case of Ukraine, informal deals, clientelism and corruption prevented elites from developing shared rules of the game. The precedence of «political expediency» over the formal decision-making procedures has led to the systematic violation of the rule of law. The decline of the rule of law contributed to the inefficient institutional equilibrium in which informal rules set the trend behavior for political players. Once established (in the mid 1990s) this set of institutions inhibited the growth of a full-fledged market, functional democracy, effective state and integrated nation. Incomplete reforms in each of these areas indicate that Ukraine faces a

¹ The first draft of this paper was presented at the PONARS Eurasia policy conference in Washington, DC on September 18-19, 2015 and was published in the PONARS policy memo series. See, Matsiyevsky Y., Getting out of an institutional trap: Ukraine's survival and the role of the West. Available at: <http://www.ponarseurasia.org/memo/breaking-out-institutional-trap-ukraine-survival-and-role-west>

syndrome of problems that reinforce each other. In other words, Ukraine finds itself in systemic institutional trap [2].

Although elections and two mass protests (of 2004 and 2014) brought about changes of people in power, the essence of the Ukrainian regime remains unchanged. Ukraine's Freedom House democratization index has always been within the range of one point (4.00 – 4.97, measured on the scale from 1 to 7), which corresponds to the "transitional government or hybrid regime" category. While Baltic and East European states democratized and most of Eurasian states digressed to authoritarianism, Ukraine appears to be at the crossroads again. Most Ukrainians, a large part of Ukraine's elite and many in the West want it to join the club of democracies. On the other side, however, are Ukrainian populists, rent-seekers and aggressive Putin's regime. Which side prevails, depends not only on Ukraine, but also on the will of external players.

Ukraine facing the systemic vulnerability

It has been almost two years since the 2014 revolution brought another set of leaders into power. The new president and the parliament declared encompassing reform program, however as the implementation is slowing down, the confidence in the new leadership is melting away [12]. What are the chances that Ukraine succeeds in moving forward and what are the potential threats?

It was well established in the developmental literature that the change of the country's trajectory could occur in result of severe internal or external shock, when the ruling group is facing the threat of losing power or even physical existence. The theory of "systemic vulnerability" posits that "developmental states will only emerge when political leaders [...] simultaneously staring down the barrels of three different guns: (1) the credible threat that any deterioration in the living standards of popular sectors could trigger unmanageable mass unrest; (2) the heightened need for foreign exchange and war materiel induced by national insecurity; and (3) the hard budget constraints imposed by a scarcity of easy revenue sources" [4].

Unless political leaders are confronted by all three constraints at the same time, they could find a way to stay in power without major institutional upgrade. Though the theory was developed on the examples of South Korea, Taiwan and Singapore, it makes sense for the Post-Soviet states as well.

Unfinished revolution, Russian aggression and deep economic decline indicate that since the end of 2013 Ukrainian leaders have been facing all three conditions of «systemic vulnerability». The experience of the three South Asian states, the Baltic states and especially Georgia suggests that under similar constraints elite should initiate the total reset of the system. Though Ukrainian leaders began an ambitious reform program the question, however, remains whether this attempt succeeds or repeats the fate of partial reforms.

Missing links: effective state and bureaucracy

A closer look at the situation in Ukraine and the elite's inconsistent response to the "systemic vulnerability" suggest that the requisite condition of development – effective institutions is currently missing in Ukraine. Above all, these are modern state and rational, in Weber's sense bureaucracy. During the first decade of independence, Ukraine has evolved from a quasi-state into the quasi-modern state [6, p. 80–111]. Predatory elite's behavior, most visible under Yanukovych, has not strengthened, but strangled the state. Of the six Weberian components of bureaucratic (rational) state organization [8, p. 269–272], Ukraine has only three: written guidelines prescribing performance criteria, division of labor and authority, and hierarchical organization. Three others, however, those forming the basis – compliance with the formal rules, meritocracy and salary based compensation exist only on paper. A number of contradictory internal instructions make the compliance with rules hardly possible. The principle of merit based selection is subverted by quota based clientelistic appointments [1]. Low wages in the civil service are compensated by the «corruption tax». By and large the high degree of personalization of Ukrainian politics makes it distant from the rational bureaucratic model. Thus «captured» by several clans and completely seized by the Yanukovych's «family» the state lost the monopoly on violence and control over the territory after the government had changed in February 2014.

From vulnerability to near systemic collapse

The "systemic vulnerability" theory posits that the acute geopolitical and fiscal constraints urge the elite to create a "broad coalition". "Broad coalitions are best constructed and sustained with side payments to popular sectors; but the provision of such payments is rendered difficult by security threats,

which siphon revenues into the defense sector, and by resource limitations, which impose hard budget constraints. Systemic vulnerability, thus makes the reconciliation of coalitional, geopolitical, and fiscal constraints a matter of ruling elites' political survival" [4, p. 331].

Sustaining broad coalition requires the ability to export high value-added goods, what is impossible without major institutional upgrade. But the upgrade requires viable institutional base and this is what Ukraine lacks the most. Under current constraints the very first challenge for politicians and society is to restore the administrative capacity of the state without increasing the president's powers. Numerous studies demonstrate that strong presidencies have a negative impact on economic growth and consequentially democratization. Though imperfect the dual executive system in Ukraine proves more conducive for political openness and competition than the single executive system.

Building a broad coalition in practical terms means opening access to economic and political activities. Establishing the rule of law, curbing corruption, creating a business-friendly environment as well as succeeding in forming fair electoral, public prosecution and court system had to be the first step towards bridging the gap between the government and society.

Under virtually non-existent state the reaction of Ukrainian elites to the challenges of «systemic vulnerability» was twofold. First, they choose to rely on narrow instead of building a broad coalition, and second they sought to adapt to the external players. The result was deepening the gap between the government and society and the complete loss of initiative in countering Russian aggression. The absence of the viable institutional base as well as dependence on external players are two variables that distinguish Ukraine from the above mentioned countries.

Though the West is interested in solving "the Ukraine crisis", both the U.S. and the EU still look at Ukraine as the instrument in developing their new Russian policies. No wonder that after Ukrainian authorities put the question of Ukraine's survival onto the Western shoulders, the West (and Russia) demanded concessions in implementing Minsk II agreements (e.i. granting the Donbas a special status in Ukraine's constitution). Meanwhile the effectiveness of the parlia-

ment in developing the legislative base for reforms remains poor [7]. The parliament has passed only 62 out of 150 reform laws promoted by an alliance of leading civil society organizations [14]. All this implies that the Ukrainian leaders are trying to solve the question of political survival by relying on the narrow coalition and by adapting to the external players.

This analysis offers three preliminary conclusions. First, the changes within the system, at least in the short run, do not necessarily lead to a change of the system. Even experiencing acute coalitional, fiscal and geopolitical constraints the Ukrainian leaders have chosen adapting the system to internal and external pressures (by announcing reforms) but not resetting it. The reset would be possible if Ukraine has had viable institutions in place (the state and bureaucracy) and the revolution produced a genuine renewal of the elite. Currently, both conditions are absent. Though the new government is the youngest of all existing governments and the parliament was renewed by more than 60 percent, the president and the prime-minister are both counting on the old practices (informal deals and cleintelism) and people (oligarchs). Thus, to expect the current government to succeed in implementing reforms would be naïve. Some reforms, like creating a patrol police, have been successfully started, but it is doubtful it will be implemented in full. Partial reforms have never led to the change of the system. As the Soviet case inform, partial reforms contributed to the decline of the old system and to its subsequent collapse.

Second, from the broader perspective Ukraine is experiencing three processes: unfinished revolution, a decline of the weak post-soviet state, and the birth of a political nation. The February 2014 revolution is unfinished as the new leadership is poorly delivering (justice is not restored, living conditions are worsening, war is not terminated). Revolution and the Russian aggression precipitated the decline of the quasi-modern state, but stimulated the national integrity and civic activism. While the state is sick, the society is well and alive [11]². This leads to the third conclusion. With the existing set of leaders and institutions Ukraine cannot reform itself. The real driver of reforms

² By the assessment of the Transparency International through the National Integrity System, Ukrainian civil society is the strongest (out of 13) institution in the country.

is civil society, but the civic activist cannot implement reform. They can pressure for and control of the government who is in charge for implementing reforms. In order to start moving forward Ukraine needs stronger ties to the viable institutions and structures that under current constraints only the West can provide. But the West is facing a dilemma: it wants to freeze the conflict in the Donbas and it wants to see Ukraine becoming a normal country. Reaching the first goal may contradict with reaching the second one. Partial support, like partial reforms brings poor results. If the current approach to Ukraine prevails, the conflict will sooner or later be frozen and Ukraine be kept afloat, meaning it will be partially reformed, but still hybrid. Considering the weak support for authorities and the growing frustration from the ineffective reform strategy, the process, however, may slip out of control and Ukraine could embark into the new wave of chaos. In order to prevent this scenario and help the Ukrainian society to reset the system the US and the EU must anchor Ukraine to its institutions and structures.

What can the West do?

Having committed series of mistakes in relations with Yanukovich and Putin, the West, particularly the EU should act in concert in several directions.

1. Developing a new Eastern Partnership policy (EaP) (some sort of EU plus) with countries that have signed association agreements (AA) and deep and comprehensive free trade agreements (DCFTA) with EU is an urgent task [5, p. 11–21]. DCFTA is not enough as its implementation was already compromised under the Russian pressure. It is now critical to make no more delays with coming it into the effect.

Anchoring Ukraine to the European institutions can solve three problems: reform, democracy and peace. This is what the Western strategic interest is in Ukraine. Currently, this view is not shared by all Western politicians and experts, but it is up to all those wishing Ukraine a success that this view prevails.

2. The core of the new EaP policy should be a membership perspective. The former conditionality policy is no longer relevant, at least in relation to Ukraine, as the former is facing the existential threat from Russia. Now Ukraine alone is paying the highest prize for countering Russian aggression. If Ukraine fails, the cost of responding to both hard and soft security

threats for the West will rise dramatically. Sure enough, the latest migration crisis, the growth of the euroscepticism within the EU and the Eurozone crisis, will hardly bring the issue of the EU enlargement back on table in the next decade. Nevertheless, the prospect of EU membership, might make the Ukrainian elites not only more consistent in implementing reforms, but attract Foreign Direct Investments (FDI) into the country [13]. The prospects of FDI inflow will press the Ukrainian authorities to reduce the state interference into the businesses of enterprises and make the property rights more secure. This, in turn, as A. Aslund argues, could allow Ukraine to become a part of European supply chain and stimulate economic growth [3, p. 50].

3. To recognize that the real driving force of reform in Ukraine is not the government, but the public. Hence, there is a need for a comprehensive support of Ukrainian civil society in developing, promoting and implementing reforms. The formula should be: «Double support for the grass roots initiatives and a double pressure on Ukrainian authorities in the process of reforms implementation».

4. The US, the IMF and the EU must develop a rescue plan for Ukraine. This plan should abandon "more for more" approach and prioritize long term institution building over short term financial stabilization. Though Ukraine restructured its debt to private owners by \$15 bln for the next four years, it needs long term grants program instead of new loans [3, p. 54]³.

5. To abandon the instrumental view of Ukraine in relations with Russia. The Russian aggression in Ukraine has been typically called "Ukraine crisis", though without direct interference and covert Russian operations in Eastern Ukraine the separatism would be hardly possible. Since the beginning of the war, the West was working on "freezing" the conflict by being primarily concerned with the Russia's reaction. The Western part of the signatories of the Budapest memorandum (The U. S., U. K. and France) failed to provide any evident 'security assurances' to Ukraine and failed to recognize Russia a

³ Former prime minister of Lithuania Andrius Kubilius has proposed that the EU should commit 3% of its 1 trillion budget for 2014-2020, which is €30 bln. in grants to Ukraine.

party to the conflict in Ukraine. The result was traumatic to Ukraine as it had to accept asymmetric concessions to Russia.

6. Considering the de-escalation trend, Russia is unlikely to be recognized as a party to the conflict. At this circumstance the West (primarily the EU) has to uphold a uniform position in maintaining Russia's sanctions and to prevent the split in this question. Easing the sanctions may ignite a new wave of Putin's adventurism that will ultimately destroy the postwar international order.

7. Finally, the US – Ukraine strategic partnership should be filled with appropriate substance. Most part of the US congress and many experts [10] are calling for new bilateral engagement with Ukraine. This engagement should not be based on promoting any particular leaders or party, but on advancing good solutions to Ukraine's problems. In this regard the US (and EU) should engage with Ukrainian civil society to make it's voice supported and heard by Ukrainian authorities.

Institutional "binding" of Ukraine to the West will fill the institutional vacuum, enhance the normative power of constitution and thus, strengthen the administrative capacity of Ukrainian state. Elites survival in this case will be insured by the fulfillment of agreements and by compliance with the rules of the democratic political game. The rule of law will be, thus, strengthened what facilitate the transition from state of hybridity to the path of sustainable development. If the West, however, continues to consider Ukraine as a tool in containing Russia, the conflict in the East will sooner or later be frozen, Ukraine will be kept "alive", but remain in under modernized state. The only source of change in this case will be the society again.

Bibliography

1. Мацієвський Ю. Зміна влади чи зміна режиму? [Електронний ресурс] / Ю. Мацієвський // ZaxidNet 2015. – Режим доступу: http://zaxid.net/news/showNews.do?zmina_vladi_chi_zmina_rezhimu&objectId=1362975.

2. Мацієвський Ю. У пастці гібридності: зигзаги трансформації політичного режиму в Україні: [монографія] / Ю. Мацієвський. – Чернівці : Книги – XXI, 2016. – 553 с.

3. Aslund A. What Went Wrong and How to Fix It / A. Aslund // Peterson Institute for International Economics. – Washington, DC, 2015. – 277p.

4. Doner R. Systemic Vulnerability and the Origins of Developmental States: Northeast and Southeast Asia in Comparative Perspective [Electronic resource] / R. Doner, B. Ritchie, D. Slater // International Organization 59. – 2005. – Accessed: <http://home.uchicago.edu/~slater/files/Doner-Ritchie-Slater2005.pdf>.

5. Gromadzki G. Six Considerations about the Eastern Partnership / G. Gromadzki // Stefan Batory Foundation and Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, Warsaw. – 2015.

6. Harasymiw B. Post-Communist Ukraine / B. Harasymiw // Edmonton and Toronto: Canadian Institute for Ukrainian Studies Press. – 2002. – 469 p.

7. Index of Reform Monitoring (IMoRe) [Electronic resource] // Vox Ukraine, 2015. – Release 20. – Accessed: <http://voxukraine.org/2015/10/19/index-of-reform-monitoring-%D1%96more-release-20-en/>.

8. Lange M. States and Economic Development / M. Lange, K. T. Leicht, J. C. Jenkins (eds.) // Handbook of Politics. State and Society in Global Perspective. – N. Y. : Springer Publishing, 2010.

9. Polterovich V. "Institutional trap" [Electronic resource] / Victor Polterovich // The New Palgrave Dictionary of Economics Online, 2015. – Accessed: http://dictionaryofeconomics.com/article?id=pde2008_I000262.

10. Rojansky M. Are Ukraine and the U.S. allies or not? [Electronic resource] / M. Rojansky, T. E. Graham and M. Kofman // Reuters, 2015. – Accessed: <http://blogs.reuters.com/great-debate/2015/06/09/time-for-a-u-s-ukraine-strategic-partnership-thats-strategic-and-a-partnership/>.

11. The State of Corruption: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Moldova and Ukraine [Electronic resource] // Transparency International, 2015. – Accessed: <http://www.worldaffairsjournal.org/content/state-corruption-armenia-azerbaijan-georgia-moldova-and-ukraine>.

12. Two Years after Maidan: Ukrainians Committed to Democracy, Disappointed with Unmet Aspirations: Key Findings from a September 2015 IFES Survey in Ukraine [Electronic resource] // IFES. – Accessed: http://www.ifes.org/sites/default/files/ifes_public_opinion_in_ukraine_sept_2015_data_slides_final.pdf.

13. Umland A. Why and How Brussels May Help Kyiv: Ten Western Policy Proposals to Save the Ukrainian State from Failure [Electronic resource] / A. Umland, K. Fedorenko // Krytyka, 2015. – Accessed: <http://krytyka.com/en/articles/why-and-how-brussels-may-help-kyiv-ten-western-policy-proposals-save-ukrainian-state#sthash.sGr2NqQ1.dpuf>.

14. Week in view [Electronic resource] // Reanimation package of reforms, 2015. – Accessed: <http://www.rpr.org.ua/en>.

Юрій Мацієвський

ЯК УКРАЇНІ ВИСЛИЗНУТИ З ПАСТКИ ГІБРИДНОСТІ І ПОЧАТИ РУХ ВПЕРЕД?

Анотація. Неефективна інституційна рівновага (інституційна пастка) сформувалася в Україні ще у 90-х рр. XX ст. У цих умовах революція 2014 р. і російська контрреволюція ввели країну в стан майже системного краху. З чинною сукупністю еліт та інституцій Україна навряд чи зможе реформувати себе сама. Для того, щоб вижити, Україні потрібні тісніші зв'язки із західними інститутами, ніж ті, що передбачені Угодою про асоціацію з ЄС.

Ключові слова: інституційна пастка, системна уразливість, гібридний режим, Україна.